Strategic Land Use Planning Workshop

February 23 and 24th, 2000, Richmond, BC

SYNTHESIS OF DISCUSSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The workshop was sponsored by FRBC and RMD to engage Strategic Land Use Planning practitioners (see Appendix A for participants) in discussions about a vision for the future.

This document is organized as follows:

- PART 1 is a summary of comments from the plenary sessions (Open Forum, Lessons Learned, Monitoring and What's Next).
- PART 2 groups the above discussions and results of the Break Out Groups into themes.
- PART 3 summarizes the above discussions into messages.

The entire document (called the Synthesis of Discussions) will provide information to government about Strategic Land Use Planning and it will also form the basis for a workplan.

The following notes reflect what people SAID at the workshop, they are opinions -- not consensus agreements.

NOTE: *Italicized font* reflects speakers comments, regular font reflects comments from the "floor".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: Format of the document

PART 1 Summary of Comments from Plenary Sessions

SESSION 1: Lessons Learned
SESSION 2: Monitoring
SESSION 3: What's Next

PART 2 Themes from the Break-Out Groups

A) MONITORING: Implementation and Effectiveness

i) What do we want to achieve in monitoring?
ii) Does the provincial framework make sense and do we understand it?
iii) How can we link Strategic Land Use Plan monitoring with other programs?

105-05561/

iv) What is the role of the public in Monitoring

B) WHAT's NEXT

i) Are the current products and process still appropriate?
ii) Is resourcing adequate?
iii) How do we incorporate new strategies and initiatives into land use plans?
iv) Are socio-economic assessments still appropriate?
v) What is the role of the public and stakeholders
vi) Undertaking Landscape Unit Planning
vii) Communication
viii) Higher Level Plan designation

PART 3 MESSAGES TO GOVERNMENT

MONITORING

IMPLEMENTATION

PROCESS & PRODUCTS

RESOURCING & ROLES

COMMUNICATION

APPENDIX A: Acronyms

APPENDIX B: List of Participants

PART 1 SESSION 1: LESSONS LEARNED

(Speaker's comments are in *Italics*)

Introductory Comments (David Johns, ADM RMD)

- *"Recognize that there are challenges (for example, BC's varied geography, delivering on biodiversity, First Nations involvement, integration of coastal and upland planning, 1400 landscape units still to plan within fiscal constraints)*
- *Address the conflicting messages to tables (e.g. protect jobs vs protect environment)*
- *Government is looking for partnerships, teamwork and cooperation"*

Regional Planning: CORE (Lindsay Jones, Margaret Baakelar, Ken Vanderburgh)

- *"Regional Scale is difficult to coordinate and work with, lack of district buy-in, varied interests*
- *Gentlemen's agreements for implementation are not effective –formalize them*
- *Need to Better define the role of First Nations and local governments*
- *Regional Resource Board in Cariboo is a valuable partner to government*
- *Direct correlation between clarity of decision in Plan and implementation success*
- *HLP allows implementation to move forward"*

Subregional Planning: LRMP (Dan Adamson)

- *"Do more front end work on roles/responsibilities and expectations – perhaps a staged process would help*

- *Implementation needs higher profile and more support from government*
- *Make sure objectives and strategies link – key to implementation, lack of clarity causes problems in the future (ie Forest Practices Board investigations)"*

NGOs' perspective (Glenda Ferris, Norman Day, Philip Hogan and Open Discussion)

- *"Information gathering for cultural resources should be completed before the start*
- *Design the process to respect different social/cultural communication structures, for example, First Nations are still working out how to deliver their decisions to the LRMP table*
- *First Nations values and inventory work must be consistently referenced within LRMP negotiations*
- *First Nation capacity for communication and future working relationships, with government and local/regional non-aboriginal stakeholders, can be enhanced through participation within LRMPs*
- *Inventory baselines, including local knowledge, can assist First Nations during the operational planning and ultimately for Land Claims settlement*
- *First Nations must be able to separate land use planning from treaty/rights/title issues*
- *Government's "policy bombs" should be avoided, they negatively impact planning*
- *Balance LRMP to represent residents (ie First Nations), not just those with economic interests in the area, economic interests take timber and jobs away from First Nations*
- *Avoid "reinterpretation" of recommendations, by providing clear direction to government (don't push the conflict to implementation)*
- *Central Coast LRMP is too large an area, outstanding issues are treaty related*
- *Are we planning beyond what government can deliver?"*
- Government staff must stop "silo" mentality and be committed to the process, information sharing should be implicit
- AAC constrains planning too much
- HLP designation helps to implement some of the strategies – don't lose the other strategies just because they aren't under HLP designation
- BC's Land Use Planning Strategy has been a failure for mining; it has damaged investor confidence; it is impossible to "plan" mineral discoveries, or any kind of hidden resources, at a regional planning table.
- Some feel that the planning processes are unbalanced, where many of the groups do not represent the larger public's wishes

PART 1 SESSION 2: MONITORING

(Speaker's comments are in *Italics*)

1.2 Provincial Monitoring Framework (Stuart Gale, Consultant)

- *"Monitoring is twofold: implementation monitoring (are you carrying out the objectives/strategies in the plan?) and effectiveness monitoring (is implementation effective in achieving the objectives/strategies?)*
- *Key principles include: ensure broad consistency across the province, allow for regional flexibility, public must be involved, report out results in a timely manner*
- *The process involves listing the plan's strategies, prioritizing them, identifying a lead agency, sorting according to strategies (base and incremental strategies)*
- *Only incremental strategies are monitored as the base strategies are covered through other mechanisms"*
- Build risk assessment into monitoring by assigning relative priorities – requirement for more information may not be achievable but do the best you can
- Monitoring should be part of the planning cycle and there should be consistency for monitoring at the regional and provincial scale
- Use the provincial framework as a working document and report feedback to RMD

Kamloops LRMP (Gary Reay)

- *"Implementation and monitoring has been ongoing for the last six years, first monitoring report*

completed in December 1999
- *Approach mirrors the provincial Monitoring Framework, includes implementation and effectiveness monitoring*
- *Official monitoring committee, including members of the public has been set up*
- *Monitoring in Kamloops recommends changes if implementation is not being achieved (ie increase efforts on a project, add or revise tasks or activities for a project, develop new indicators, amend a plan objective)*
- *Monitoring report can also make general recommendations regarding the LRMP*
- *Suggestion to introduce "Planning Act" to ensure all strategies in plan are "legal", not just those under HLP"*

Vanderhoof LRMPs (Jennifer Davis)

- *"Strive to put as much resource/time into monitoring as in plan development – monitoring is not the sole responsibility of one person – it is a Cabinet approved document with sector and agency buy-in*
- *Plan implementation takes "flack" for many issues that are beyond the scope of LRMP (i.e. externalities such as global economic pressures)*
- *Clarify the role of public in monitoring – they must somehow be involved"*

Status of Plan Monitoring (Elizabeth Zweck)

- *"There are a variety of "models" being used across the province, some with formal/informal stakeholder involvement and formal/informal or no reporting out; it is an evolving process."*
- The goal should be to have the right model for the region - open and balanced

PART 1 SESSION 3: WHAT's NEXT

Provincial Overview (Warren Mitchell)

- *"BC is recognized as being a world leader in Strategic Land Use Planning*
- *Planning is an iterative process, what should we look at the 2nd time around?*
- *PAS/zoning was the the first priority - how to keep governments and stakeholders at the table the next time*
- *You shouldn't be there to get what you want, but rather to get what you need to move forward (paraphrase from Rolling Stones, Hot Rocks 1971)"*

New Initiatives (Liz Williams)

- *"Over 20 land use initiatives will require new information/practices to be incorporated into plans or to be harmonized with existing objectives; some may result in plan amendment (Salmon Agreement, Grizzly Strategy, Bill 82 Pilots, Forest Policy Review)"*
- Strategic plans need to address linkages with municipal planning and do a better job in dealing with water resource issues

Coastal Planning (John Bones)

- *"A coastal planning "guru" confirmed that BC has the necessary process elements*
- *Coastal planning is necessary to deal with threats to resource sustainability, complex jurisdictions, delivery of marine PAS*
- *Where is it going? Same as terrestrial planning but different challenges: jurisdictions, integrating coastal with terrestrial, refocus expectations*
- *BC owns the seabed"*

NGO's Perspective (Bill Bourgeois)

- *"New focus for industry is on implementation – Landscape Unit Planning*

- *Government has limited resources to undertake the plans, options include partnerships with industry (incentives required) or "big stick" approach*
- *Focus on the areas with targets* under HLP, approach progressive, positive companies, to get the initiatives started, develop a mechanism with incentives and others will likely follow"*
- Concern that companies will be self-serving, need 3rd party overview
- Objectives (i.e. numbers) are set by Plan so companies must follow them
- A new mechanism that provides balance between interests should be developed

NGO's Perspective (Jim Cooperman)

- *"Some environmentalists are skeptical about land use planning because of the "stranglehold" that the AAC and tenure system has on the landbase*
- *LRMP should continue, get objectives delivered and keep the "special" in SMZ*
- *Move to declaring the HLPs that are missing*
- *Use mediation away from table (i.e. sub committee) to resolve conflicts, it works*
- *Explore the option of initially using public input and government data to produce a draft plan that can be later be reviewed by a table in those areas without LRMP (Merritt for example)*
- *Expedite to provide full provincial coverage and consider using value-based representation*
- *Use websites to make more data available, including maps*
- *Move to Landscape Unit Plans and continue planning towards the goal of creating total resource plans – these will be needed for certification*
- *Keep public/stakeholders involved in monitoring and implementation committees, ensure there is adequate funding, ensure plans are implemented in the spirit and intent in which they were developed*
- *The employment and economic forecasts using multipliers (part of socio-economic analysis) is of little benefit – too many externalities"*
- SEA assists in highlighting implications of decisions, adds accountability, fix the system, don't abandon it, use during and at the end of process to highlight consequences -- reference to Robson Enhanced Forest Management Pilot Project – website address is: http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/PGEORGE/DISTRICT/ROBSON/index.htm
- Conflict should be resolved AT the table, not in back rooms between two interests

PART 2 THEMES FROM THE BREAK-OUT GROUPS

A) MONITORING : Implementation and Effectiveness

i) What do we want to achieve in monitoring?

- Decisions are based on local/regional knowledge; once implemented, do the results hold up? Are the objectives being achieved? Are collective expectations being met? Monitoring should identify "flaws" in the plan
- Prioritization of projects requiring funding – public must be involved to ensure level playing field for setting priorities
- Monitor ALL the strategies/guidelines – economic/tourism strategies may not have a provincial champion and may be "lost" or not adequately funded

ii) Does the provincial framework make sense and do we understand it?

- Most felt it made sense to have a provincial framework, not all were sure if they fully understood it (the framework has just been released)
- Several comments about clarifying the monitoring of base and incremental items
- Should be flexible – i.e. monitoring committee may not always be desirable
- May be irrelevant for those resources closely tied to global economies (i.e. minerals)

*Targets=spatial targets by percentage of land base

iii) How can we link Strategic Land Use Plan monitoring with other programs?

- Attempt to translate plan objectives into indicators (which can be analyzed objectively)
- Use Plan indicators as part of forest certification (make it measurable)
- Link monitoring to TSR, Municipal Planning, Environmental Assessment
- Improve communication between "programs" vertically and horizontally

iv) What is the role of the public in Monitoring

- Two types of "public" – "engaged stakeholders" and broader public
- General agreement that public should have a role – desirable to keep continuity with the same public engaged in plan development
- Some NGOs may assist in resources for implementation
- Difficult to avoid "revolving door" – must find a way to keep public motivated
- Broader public are disconnected from strategic planning process – use websites, mailouts, questionnaires to educate, advertize and establish a feedback loop
- "Engaged" public's role to ensure implementation/amendment is consistent with plan intent; the broader public's role could be in monitoring the provincial goals of the strategic land use planning program

B) WHAT's NEXT?

i) Are the current products and process still appropriate?

- General view that current model/framework/principles are appropriate – "it isn't perfect but it works", mining sector does not agree that the process works for mining
- How to complete plans sooner without foregoing public and First Nations participation? – a technically based "advisory role" is not palatable to some NGOs
- Do a better job at the start: refine LRMP ToR to focus on strategic issues, manage expectations, train ALL participants in the area of interest based negotiations
- Terminology (objectives/goals/strategies) inconsistent across province and causes confusion – follow guidelines put out by RMD, vet language with implementers
- Design process to better reflect cultural differences, particularly where the majority of the area's population is First Nations, recognize different decision making structure
- "Re-interpretation" (by staff) of objectives during plan approval is seen as a critical issue to many (non government) workshop participants
- Clarify role of government staff – negotiator? information provider? advocate?
- The process must deal with conflicts head on – not in back rooms or shuffled into fuzzy objectives or vis a vis the "technical fix"
- Explore an incremental approval process with "milestones" – keep people motivated and avoid surprises at the end

ii) Is resourcing adequate?

- Given fiscal realities, maybe the finite resources could be used more effectively
- Process managers must have training and refresher courses in facilitation techniques that lead to consensus; identify the staff who are "naturals" and move them around
- Do skills training early, include table participants – get the right relationships
- Cost efficiencies could be achieved if government becomes more responsible (i.e. coordination and sharing of government data, work towards a corporate voice)
- Employ a facilitator who understands BC's planning framework – will save money

iii) How do we incorporate new strategies and initiatives into land use plans?

- Suggestion that initiatives affecting strategic land use planning be listed (coordinated by RMD); any NEW initiatives be vetted by the planning tables
- New initiatives should be vetted through IAMC, IRPC, ADMs and Deputies; sponsoring agency must demonstrate how the initiative will link to planning
- Not all new policies may impact on a plan – determine whether the policy has already been addressed, is the policy consistent with the plan – if not, which should change, the plan or the policy? should changes wait for 10 year review?

- Government "owes" it's facilitators the right to be informed on new initiatives; avoid delivering a "hard and fast" policy to be enforced regardless of feedback
- Integrate initiatives/strategies into a larger VISION, use a grassroots approach and set priorities; make sure communication goes vertically and horizontally

iv) Are socio-economic assessments still appropriate?

- Current model appears to have challenges for just about every interest, but most agree that aspects of SEA are important and useful
- It is time consuming, but it helps to compare between scenarios
- Rebuild to better reflect challenges in the measurability of certain resources (recreation, biodiversity, minerals)
- Try different models such as that being piloted in the Robson Valley
- Use Internet and encourage spacial planning for innovative zoning options
- Introduce the base case assessment earlier in the process

v) What is the role of the public and stakeholders?

- Recognize enormous time commitment, personal costs, financial assistance is necessary, often done on a volunteer basis
- As outlined in the plans' ToR: i.e. information, advice, knowledge, recommendations to government, communication to interest groups, process advocates
- Expectations, roles/responsibilities should be tackled early, and managed throughout the process

vi) Undertaking Landscape Unit Planning

- Forge partnerships with "progressive" side of industry in areas with targets while maintaining role for 3rd party overview – communicate successes, others will follow
- NGO community nervous about industry taking lead in landscape unit planning
- Government should spend more time communicating HLP policy to staff and NGOs, it is not clear to many involved in planning
- Government needs to better communicate what is expected from Landscape Unit planning, is there room for a similar level of planning, less comprehensive
- Expectations about Landscape Unit may be out of line (i.e. is it a mini LRMP?)

vii) Communication

- Improve communication from government to planning tables with respect to new policy or strategy initiatives and vice versa
- Communicate successes from the plans to the broader public (taxpayers/voters) – better sell the program to those not engaged in the process
- Allow for/encourage communication between constituents and table representatives

viii) Higher Level Plan designation

- More education/communication around HLP for staff and NGOs is required
- Do do we "legalize" the plan for ALL objectives? I.e. Broaden the legal designation of HLP to assist in implementation
- Target setting during the planning process is critical for smooth implementation

PART 3 MESSAGES

MONITORING

Does the provincial monitoring framework make sense? Generally yes, however, it needs more time for review. Allow flexibility in the framework for regional differences. Begin monitoring between

regions (i.e. for conservation goals).

The role of the public in monitoring. Important to first define "public" as "engaged stakeholders" and broader public. Agreement that public must have a role – attempt to keep continuity with the same public engaged in plan development. Manage expectations while allowing flexibility.

Linking Plan monitoring with other programs. Various ideas put forward, underlying theme is to improve communication between "programs" vertically and horizontally.

IMPLEMENTATION

Government must focus more on implementation than it has in the past (i.e. commitment of staff and resources) and must address the issue of staff continuity – train staff through to monitoring, link with operational staff

PROCESS & PRODUCTS

Are the current products and process still appropriate? General agreement that current model/products are appropriate – "it isn't perfect but it works for most interests". Work needed: accommodating mining interests (industry feels strategic level planning has failed them, that it is impossible to "plan" for mineral discoveries), First Nations communication structures, representation of First Nations population, timeliness in plan completion, public's expectations, improving socioeconomic analysis, "reclarification" of plan objectives, new initiatives and role of government staff.

Incorporating new strategies and initiatives into Plans. Improve the status quo – it is not acceptable to develop policy independently of the larger land use planning program. Suggestions for improvement are noted in earlier text.

Are socioeconomic assessments still appropriate? Current model needs review – it has challenges for almost every interest, however most agree that aspects of SEA are important and useful.

RESOURCING & ROLES

Is resourcing adequate? Use the funding more efficiently, look for partnerships, train the participants, find the "right" facilitator, coordinate the data and set priorities.

Role of the public and stakeholders. Government must be honest and up front about the process in order to manage expectations. Regional resource boards can be useful partners in implementation.

Role of provincial government at the Table. Needs clarification – negotiator? data provider? advocate? Better coordinate agency's work and make data more accessible.

COMMUNICATION

Communicating Value of LRMP Several NGOs agreed to form the "Provincial Land Use Planning Communication Group", the intent of which is to communicate (to decision makers) the support and need for ongoing land use planning and implementation. Phil Hallinan at Hallinan@sageserve com has agreed to coordinate the efforts of this group.

Communication on HLP. More communication/education (to staff and public) is required for HLP and landscape unit planning specifically, and for the strategic land use planning program in general

Landscape Unit Planning. Discomfort for some around Landscape Unit planning regarding costs,

lack of strategic targets, priorities, level of public input, industry partnerships, AAC constraints, ability to protect biodiversity, etc. Government needs to communicate purpose and scope, not build false expectations

APPENDIX A

Acronyms:

AAC - Allowable Annual Cut
ADM - Assistant Deputy Minister
CORE - Commission on Resources & Environment
HLP - Higher Level Plan

IAMC - InterAgency Management Committee
IRPC - Integrated Resource Planning Committee
LRMP - Land and Resource Management Plan
RMD - Resource Management
NGO - Non Government Organization
PAS - Protected Areas Strategy
RMZ - Resource Management Zone
SEA - Socio-Economic Analysis
TSR - Timber Supply Review

APPENDIX B

Strategic Land Use Planning Workshop
List of Participants

(NOTE: those invited but unable to attend are not included on this list)

NGOs and FIRST NATIONS

Bill Bourgeois - Lignum (Vancouver)
Bill Wareham - Sierra Club (Victoria)
Bruce McKnight - BC Yukon Chamber of Mines (Vancouver)
Dallas Smith - Tlowitsis Nation, Kwakuitl Dist. Coun& Musgamogw TC (Campbell River)
David Borth - BC Cattlemen's Assoc. (Kamloops)
Eileen Fletcher - Tourism Action Society (Kootenays)
Geoff Morrison - Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (Calgary)
George Smith - Canadian Parks And Wilderness Society (Gibsons)
Gil Arnold - BC Spaces for Nature
Glenda Ferris - CIS LRMP (Houston)
Jim Cooperman - BC Environmental Network (Chase)
John Bergenske - East Kootenay Environmental Society
John Murray - Chamber of Mines of Eastern B.C. (Nelson)
Keith McClain - McGregor Model Forest (Prince George)
Kevin McNaney - UBC Sustainable Development Research Institute
Lloyd Manchester - BC Environmental Network
Neil Meagher International Woodworkers Association (Prince George)
Neils Christiensen - Salmon River Round Table (Salmon Arm)
Norman Day - Tahltan Rep at CIS LRMP (Telegraph Ck)
Phil Hallinan - BC Wildlife Federation
Philip Hogan - Liaison Coordinator for Heiltsuk Nation
Ray Pillman - Outdoor Recreation Council of BC (Vancouver)
Rob Smailes - North Okanagan Regional District (Vernon)
Ross Peck - Guide Outfitter (Fort St. John)
Walter Matosevic - Northern Forest Products Association (Canfor, Prince George)
Wayne Sawchuck - Chetwynd Environmental Society

IAMC CHAIRS

Andrew Whale (Kootenay)
Drew Carmichael (Lower Mainland)
Fred Baxter (Thompson-Okanagan)
Herb Langin (Cariboo)
Rick Heathman (Omineca Peace)
Wally Bergen (Skeena)

IAMC COORDINATORS

Dan Adamson (Omineca Peace)
Elizabeth Zweck (Skeena)
Ken Vanderburgh (Cariboo)
Lindsay Jones (Vancouver Island)
Margaret Bakelaar (Kootenay)
Peter Jones (Lower Mainland)
Phil Whitfield (Thomp – Okanagan)

LRMP Provincial Government "Process Managers"

Betty Schweizer (Mackenzie)
Bruce Walter (Lillooet)
Dorothy Wharton (Robson Valley)
Eamon O'Donoghue (Kalum)
Gary Reay (Kamloops)
Gunter Hoehne (Lakes)
Jane Lloyd Smith (Bulkley)
Janice Edwards (Fort St. John)
Jeff Burrows (Prince George)
Jennifer Davis (Vanderhoof)
Jim Forbes (Dawson Creek)
Maggie Marsland (Kispiox)
Mary Vislai Beale (Fort Nelson)
Mike Slivitsky (Fort St. James)
Steve Carr and Dave Tudhope (Okanagan Shuswap)
Tom Soehl (Cassiar Iskut Stikine)

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

David Johns (ADM)
John Bones (Director)
Michael Coon (Director)
Warren Mitchell (Director)

IRPC/GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Gil Scott (BC Parks)
Bob Peart (VI B)
Brian Fardoe (MoF)
Bruce Sieffert (MoF)
Colin Magee (MEM) 23rd
Teresa Morris (24th and 25th)
Liz Williams (MELP)
Jennifer Ellis (FRBC)
Rob Gay (FRBC)
Rob Menes (Ag)
Rolf Schmitt (MEM)

Julie Glover (Land Reserve Commission)

Facilitator/Coordinator

Stuart Gale
Janet Fontaine

Last Updated: 06/26/00

This page was last modified: March 26, 2003

•Top •Copyright •Disclaimer •Privacy •Feedback GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA